

Rating the Web Sites of Land Grant Universities and State Departments of Agriculture

Jon C. Phillips¹

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
Food Marketing and Agribusiness Management Department
3801 West Temple Ave.
Pomona, CA 91768
jcphillips@csupomona.edu

Key words:

land grant universities, departments of agricultural economics, state departments of agriculture, web sites, web pages, web design, Internet, e-commerce, electronic communication

*Selected Paper prepared for presentation at the American Agricultural Economics Association
Annual Meeting, Providence, Rhode Island, July 24-27, 2005*

Copyright 2005 by Jon C. Phillips. All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on such copies.

¹ Acknowledgements: I am motivated to express my gratitude for the assistance of the other individuals involved in implementing this project. First, I thank April Drukin, who served as a member of the rating panel and assisted with compiling the results. I thank an anonymous member of the rating panel, and I thank Sylvia Yang, who assisted with compiling the results and provided editorial assistance. Any errors are the responsibility of the author.

Rating the Web Sites of Land Grant Universities and State Departments of Agriculture

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page No.
Abstract	3
Problem Statement	3
Objectives	4
Methods	5
Results	10
Conclusions for Web Sites of Land Grant Universities	11
Conclusions for Web Sites of Departments of Agricultural Economics	13
Conclusions for Web Sites of State Departments of Agriculture	15
Feedback, Errors, and Omissions	17
Appendix A: Ratings for Web Sites of Land Grant Universities	17
Appendix B: Ratings for Web Sites of Departments of Agricultural Economics (or Equivalent) at Land Grant Universities	36
Appendix C: Ratings for Web Sites of State Departments of Agriculture	53
Index of Web Site Ratings	66

Rating the Web Sites of Land Grant Universities and State Departments of Agriculture

Abstract

For at least ten years, educational and government organizations have used the Internet to communicate with their respective clienteles. Land grant universities, departments of agricultural economics, and state departments of agriculture have launched web sites to achieve various communication goals, including, among others: to disseminate research results, to generate positive publicity among various constituencies, to promote agricultural activities, and to recruit employees. This report is the result of an effort to systematically evaluate, rate, and comment on the web sites of land grant universities, departments of agricultural economics, and state departments of agriculture. A panel of reviewers rated the web sites of these organizations. The results of reviews of a total of 177 web sites are presented. The following aspects were rated for each site: loading time, visual appeal, ease of navigation, quantity of useful information, and overall effectiveness. Individuals responsible for web sites should strive to achieve visual appeal and accessibility, and to avoid broken links and the under construction phenomenon. Three web sites in each category are identified as being highly effective, exemplary sites. Web designers and other representatives may use the results to plan new web page designs and to improve current pages/sites.

Problem Statement

For at least ten years, educational and government organizations have used interactive media to communicate with their respective clienteles. The Internet in particular has provided these organizations with an effective and versatile tool for conveying and receiving information. Land grant universities, for example, have launched web sites to achieve the following aims, among others: to generate positive publicity among various constituencies; to disseminate

research results; to recruit students, faculty, and staff; and to announce campus events. State departments of agriculture have employed web sites for analogous functions and to promote agriculture within their respective states. These types of organizations have used a tremendous amount of creativity and innovation to achieve Internet-related goals. Designers and users of the relevant web sites could benefit greatly from best practices employed on a subset of these sites. There has not been a great deal of effort to systematically evaluate, rate, and comment on the web sites of land grant universities and state departments of agriculture, however. This report is intended to fill this gap.

Objectives

The primary objective of this report is to provide a rating guide for web sites of land grant universities and (U.S.) state departments of agriculture. Three different types of web sites were considered: 1) home pages and top-tier links of land grant universities, 2) home pages and top-tier links of departments of agricultural economics (including other variations such as applied economics and food and resource economics), and 3) home pages and top-tier links of (U.S.) state departments of agriculture and U.S. territorial departments of agriculture, as applicable.

This project was intended to benefit two classes of users. The first class is the group of web designers and developers at the organizations whose web sites are rated herein. This report will provide feedback on their respective web sites. Such individuals can use this report to identify the highest-rated web sites from their respective categories. The intent is to allow them to visit exemplary web sites and to obtain ideas that may be adapted and adopted for their own web sites. The other class of users is the general population, especially agriculture students and representatives of agribusinesses. These individuals will have an accessible, comprehensive

reference to web sites for land grant universities, departments of agricultural economics, and state departments of agriculture. A secondary objective of this report is therefore to facilitate research, job seeking, and obtaining information about educational programs.

Methods

Under the supervision of the author, student research assistants compiled a master list of the following organizations and their web sites: land grant universities, departments of agricultural economics at land grant universities, and state departments of agriculture. Lists of the first category, land grant universities, are readily available. Each state has a land grant university, established by the First Morrill Act of 1862. Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, and the District of Columbia also have a land grant university each. Several states in the southern U.S. have a second land grant university, as a result of the Second Morrill Act of 1890. These universities were included in this study. There were 72 web sites identified and rated in this category.

A bit more judgment was required to determine which departments to include in the second category, departments of agricultural economics (or equivalent). All departments of agricultural economics, applied economics, or food and resource economics from the universities identified above were included. A small number of land grant universities include agricultural economics within their economics departments, and these departments were also included. Other universities include agricultural economics in broader departments. For example, the University of Alaska includes agricultural economics in its Department of Resource Management and Delaware State University has a bachelor of agribusiness degree program in its Agriculture and Natural Resources Department. In cases such as these, the broader departments were not included in the study. It did not seem fair to compare a web site from a department that offers a

broad range of programs besides agricultural economics with departments that specialize in agricultural (or resource) economics. In addition, two campuses of the University of California (Berkeley and Davis) were included, due to the extent of their programs in agricultural and resource economics. There were 53 web sites identified for this category.

Identifying the departments of agriculture for the fifty U.S. states and their respective web sites was generally straightforward. One exception, however, was Arkansas. It turns out that Arkansas does not have a state department of agriculture. After a bit of research, we identified the Arkansas State Plant Board. A phone call confirmed that this is the closest thing Arkansas has to a department of agriculture, so this was included in the study. In certain cases, state departments of agriculture are actually combined with another function. Examples of this include the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services and the Alabama Department of Agriculture and Industries. These combined departments were included in the study. The departments of agriculture for the U.S. Virgin Islands and for Puerto Rico were also included. Thus, there were 52 web sites identified for the third category. (In total, 177 web sites were identified and evaluated in this project.)

A panel of three reviewers visited and reviewed all web sites from the three categories above that could be identified. The panel consisted of one faculty member (i.e., the author of this report) and two student research assistants. The membership of the panel remained consistent throughout the study. In other words, the same three reviewers evaluated each and every web site appearing in this paper. Prior to the start of this project, the author attended a week-long workshop in web site design. This workshop was held by the Department of Instructional and Information Technology Learning at Cal Poly Pomona University. The author trained the student

assistants before they began rating web sites for this project to ensure accurate and consistent ratings.

Panel members considered the following specific characteristics of the web sites: loading time, visual appeal, ease of navigation, and quantity of useful information provided. Following is an explanation of these factors, and additional comments about accessibility.

Something very basic to consider in designing and implementing a web site is loading time. Web users in general do not like to wait for a web site to load. Some will even click away if a page takes too long to load. Keep in mind, web users have Internet connections of varying speeds, from fast (DSL) to slow (dial up). For this reason, web designers should strive to keep their web pages relatively simple so they do not take a long time to load. Structures that cause delays in loading web sites (e.g., being directed to another server) should be avoided if possible. Some web features (e.g., a counter) may slow down the loading of web pages. For this reason, web designers should carefully consider the tradeoffs between features, functionality, and loading time.

Another issue to consider regarding web site design is visual appeal. Designing an attractive web page is not like solving an algebra problem; there is no one right answer. Web users have different preferences, so it is important for web designers to solicit feedback from targeted users before settling on a final design. Systematic processes (e.g., surveys and focus groups) have proven useful in this process. While there is no magic formula for a visually appealing web site, there are some basic rules of thumb. First, try to have an attractive color scheme. Second, have elements such as graphics and links laid out in a logical and uncluttered way. Third, use attractive and legible fonts. One design technique that adds visual appeal should be mentioned. That technique is the use of rotating images. With rotating images, a small number

(say, six) images are stored on the server for use in one particular place on a web page. When a user loads a web page, one of these images is randomly selected by the server to appear on the user's monitor. When users visit web pages often, rotating images add to variety and visual appeal.

Web designers should strive to make their sites easy to navigate. Links should clearly and unambiguously indicate the information to which is being linked. The fewer clicks a user has to make to obtain the desired information, the better. Text that is underlined should indicate a link. Sometimes, text that serves as a link is in a different color, and the underlining appears when the cursor rolls over the link. This is also acceptable. Some users prefer links to open in the same browser, to avoid too many open windows.

A truism regarding web sites is that they have to be maintained. Broken links occur when a user clicks on a link and obtains a page with a message like "Page Not Found." When this happens, the user's time is wasted and (s)he may become frustrated. This also is a sign that the sponsoring organization does not care very much about its site (or the users, by extension). Another negative web site phenomenon occurs when a user clicks on a link and is notified that the feature is "under construction." This can disappoint and frustrate a user. Web masters should try to avoid broken links and the under construction phenomenon if at all possible. When I encountered these deficiencies in the web sites in this study, the ratings of the offending sites suffered significantly. Visual appeal, avoiding broken links, and avoiding "under construction" could be considered the bread and butter of web design. Keeping a home page fresh and new requires constant updating, which could be considered a form of maintenance. It is not enough to simply put up a web page, never change anything, and hope to have lots of traffic. The Internet

has become very competitive, so frequent changes are necessary. If a user visits a site a second time and it looks exactly the same as it did before, it is less likely (s)he will visit a third time.

Web sites were evaluated with regard to quantity of useful information provided. The specific type of information expected from a web site varies according to the purpose of the web site and the sponsoring organization. This study examined three categories of web sites, namely, web sites of land grant universities, departments of agricultural economics, and state departments of agriculture. Web sites were compared to other web sites in the same category regarding the quantity of useful information to which they provided access. Users expect to be able to actually obtain desired information from selected web sites. Listing a definition of the organization and contact information is considered the low end of the scale for information provision. Higher ratings were awarded to web sites that provided access to incrementally greater amounts of useful information, compared to other sites in their respective categories.

While not considered explicitly in this project, accessibility should also be given serious consideration by web designers. Many users are visually impaired, and some have special software that reads web pages and produces audible sounds (i.e., words) that represent the pages that are accessed. There is a method available to label images so that the visually impaired user will hear, for example, "Image of Morrill Hall," instead of just "image." Recently, users have begun using devices other than personal computers (e.g., mobile phones) to access the web. While I am not privy to the techniques for making web sites accessible from these types of devices, senior web designers may benefit by researching these techniques and implementing them. There is a small fraction of the population who becomes extremely confused when a web page has a link to itself. (The user clicks on such a link, and cannot figure out why it appears as

if nothing happened.) In the spirit of improving accessibility, therefore, web designers should avoid such links.

For each web site reviewed, each reviewer assigned a numerical rating for the four characteristics mentioned above and for overall effectiveness and provided a brief summary comment. Ratings were between one (1) and five (5), with five being the best. The purpose of this study was not to rate the quality of the organizations (i.e., land grant universities, departments of agricultural economics, or state departments of agriculture) or their programs. Rather, the ratings were based on the web sites only. For this reason, the reader should not interpret the ratings reported below to be evaluations of the sponsoring organizations. To reiterate, the web sites are all that are being rated. The overall effectiveness rating of each panel member was not required to be an average of his/her four component ratings. This allowed for a web site with some poorly rated aspects to be rated quite well overall, due to the components working synergistically. It also allowed for a web site with a performance in one area which was perceived to be particularly weak to be rated poor overall, despite other elements being rated relatively well. The overall effectiveness ratings were figured by averaging the overall effectiveness ratings of the panel members, and rounding to the nearest half-number. (Ratings appear in the appendices.) The overall effectiveness ratings are signified by number of mice, which symbolize the device used to navigate web sites. Thus, the best web sites are designated “five mice” web sites.

Results

The results are listed in three appendices. Appendix A contains the results for land grant universities. Appendix B and Appendix C contain the results for departments of agricultural economics and state departments of agriculture, respectively.

The members of the panel selected by consensus the three best web sites in each of the three categories. They are listed below, by category, in alphabetical order.

Land Grant Universities:

University of Connecticut <http://www.uconn.edu/>

University of Illinois <http://www.uillinois.edu/>

Oregon State University <http://oregonstate.edu>

Departments of Agricultural Economics (or Equivalent) at Land Grant Universities:

Michigan State University Dept. of Agricultural Economics www.aec.msu.edu/agecon/

Purdue University Department of Agricultural Economics www.agecon.purdue.edu

Utah State University Department of Economics <http://www.econ.usu.edu/>

State Departments of Agriculture:

Michigan Department of Agriculture www.michigan.gov/mda

Missouri Department of Agriculture <http://www.mda.mo.gov/>

South Dakota Department of Agriculture <http://www.state.sd.us/doa/>

Conclusions for Web Sites of Land Grant Universities

The web sites of land grant universities were somewhat difficult to rate, in that the goals and formats are so diverse. A university has many constituencies, including current and prospective students, faculty and staff, alumni, donors and potential donors, community members, sports fans, and so on. The information on the home page, and what is given prominence, will vary depending on which group(s) the university is targeting with its web site. The design of a university web site, especially the home page, is often a balancing act regarding which type of information to feature.

As an example, let us consider which information would be useful to one group of users: prospective students. If a university has any top-rated programs or award-winning faculty, they may want to highlight these things prominently. Providing links to pages that may appeal to prospective students (especially fun things) would be a good idea. Of course, what these links should be depends on the university in question as well as the profile of the students the university would like to attract. A couple of examples would be a link to the Equestrian Club and a link to a local water park. Whatever advantages the university has in terms of facilities (e.g., new and luxurious dorms) or climate or placement of graduates should also be displayed. Something very basic that could benefit potential students would be directions to the campus and the hours of operation of the visitors' center. It would be wise to make it easy for prospective students to contact someone in the admissions office who could answer their questions, by providing either an email link or a phone number. Going beyond these generic recommendations would require research by interested university representatives. Focus groups of new students shortly after they arrive on campus may help to identify what admitted and enrolled students sought when they selected a university.

One final web-related issue universities must address is the degree to which their respective home pages should be news-oriented. There are differing schools of thought on this issue, and the route taken will likely depend on status of the public affairs function in the organization. Related to this issue is the manner and extent to which campus events are featured on the university home page. Because events come and go, featuring different events as they come up is a way for a university to keep its home page fresh and interesting. This may also serve to drive return traffic to the web site. It also provides a service to various stakeholder groups, including students, faculty and staff, and members of the community.

Conclusions for Web Sites of Departments of Agricultural Economics

The rating panel felt certain items (i.e., links) should be included on all web sites of departments of agricultural economics (or resource economics, applied economics, etc.). These items are About Us/Overview/Mission Statement, faculty, publications, (degree) programs, students, job opportunities, links, and a search function. As an alternative, the information that could typically be displayed on an About Us/Overview/Mission Statement page could be displayed on the home page of the department. Some departments had a link for a welcome from the department chair, which could accomplish the same thing. As unbelievable as it may seem to agricultural economists, a substantial amount of people have never even heard of agricultural economics, and a greater number do not have a clear idea of what the field encompasses. Departments should use their web sites as communication tools to convey the basic message of what agricultural and resource economists do. Also, it is a good idea to describe what a person who earns a degree offered by the department can do with it. If this message is conveyed in an interesting and compelling way, it may enhance student recruitment.

The faculty link on a department home page should lead to information about the faculty members of the department. (Contrast this with the Information for Faculty links on many university home pages.) Typically, the faculty link on department pages leads to a directory of faculty, which includes names, office numbers, and phone numbers. Agricultural economics has several distinct sub-specializations, e.g., agribusiness management, production economics, environmental and resource economics, agricultural finance, international development, community economics, and so on. For this reason, it is very helpful to list the specialty of the faculty members on the directory, to save the user from having to click a link for each individual faculty member to find someone who specializes in agribusiness, for example. Often, faculty

directories have links that lead to department-sponsored web pages for each faculty member. These pages typically contain useful information pertaining to each faculty member, such as, degrees earned, courses taught, and publications. Sometimes, there is an email link on the faculty directory or the individual faculty pages for each faculty member, which facilitates communication. In my opinion, the best faculty directories list specialties and include photos, in addition to contact information. Another option for departments is to have a link for People on the home page, which leads to links for specific groups of people (e.g., faculty, staff, students, extension agents).

It is helpful for departments of agricultural economics to have a prominent link on their respective home pages for publications. This benefits researchers and practitioners who are seeking access to research produced by department representatives. Michigan State University's Department of Agricultural Economics, for example, provides a link on its home page for publications. Clicking on this link leads to another page that lists the following department publication series: staff papers (via AgEcon Search), selected agricultural economics reports, and international development papers. Under the heading "Other Publications," this page lists annual department publications lists; dissertations, theses, and Plan B Papers; and recent books. Abstracts are available for the dissertations, theses, and Plan B Papers. (Some of the Plan B papers are available in full text.)

With regard to students, departments exhibited a great deal of variation in how they were featured on web sites. Some sites had student profiles, including photos, of undergraduates. If executed properly, these could positively affect student recruitment. Most department web sites have a link to a directory of graduate students. These directories varied in the amount of information displayed, from simply names/phone numbers/office addresses to photo portraits

and/or specializations. Some departments used their web sites to promote the placement of recent Ph.D. graduates. UC Berkeley is a fine example of this. Departments could also include a link to a list of job openings at their respective universities.

It is helpful for academic departments to have a link for job opportunities. At a minimum, departments should have a link for job opportunities in their own department. As an added service, departments can provide a link to a page that lists job opportunities for agricultural economists from various employers. The University of Illinois Department of Agricultural and Consumer Economics is commended for providing this service.

With regard to links, there is a great deal of scope for departments of agricultural economics to make their web sites useful to targeted users. Some users may benefit from links to the applicable state department of agriculture, the USDA, professional associations (e.g., the American Agricultural Economics Association), the home pages of agribusinesses and food industry firms, etc. Opportunities are endless in this area. The only obstacle is a lack of imagination and time to implement ideas. Designers should keep in mind, however, that such links require constant monitoring and updating to prevent them from going out of date and becoming broken links. Finally, providing a search function can be helpful to the users of these web sites.

Conclusions for Web Sites of State Departments of Agriculture

The appropriate style and content of the web sites of state departments of agriculture will be influenced by their respective missions and organizational cultures. When designing web sites, representatives of state departments of agriculture should consider first of all who they are aiming to serve. It could be agricultural producers, food industry firms, consumers, state legislators, some other group, or some combination of these. Once the groups being served have

been established, the individuals involved in the design process should determine the information and/or services needed by these users and what would be appropriate to provide. Crises related to pests and diseases frequently affect agriculture at the state level, and such issues are often featured prominently on the home pages of state departments of agriculture. Many times, events related to agriculture (e.g., fairs) are featured on these pages. State departments of agriculture can use their web sites to promote various types of agricultural enterprises in their respective states. For example, the Connecticut Department of Agriculture has a link designated “Visit Maple Sugarhouses” on its home page. This link leads to a PDF file that is a guide to Connecticut sugarhouses.

As government agencies, state departments of agriculture can and should use their web sites to provide services to their respective clienteles. For example, the Arizona Department of Agriculture’s Agricultural Consultation and Training program provides assistance in the following areas: pesticide and worker protection, water quality regulations on animal feeding operations, comprehensive nutrient management plan development, and air quality. They use their web site to provide information about these programs, rather than on-line delivery of services. They provide many documents and checklists related to these areas, as well as a toll-free telephone number, a fax number, a mailing address, and an email link. A step beyond merely providing information is for state departments of agriculture to implement an e-commerce strategy. Such a strategy allows users of services to do business (e.g., make purchases) over the Internet. Florida’s Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, for example, has established an e-Gov Center. According to the web site, users can “conduct on-line transactions with the agency, such as purchasing a subscription, registering for a training course or exam, or

renewing a license for your business. You may purchase the service(s) you need using your credit card.”

Finally, one obvious service that these departments can provide is job listings on their web sites. At a minimum, they should provide job listings for their own department. It would be better if they provide access to listings for the entire state government. The South Dakota Department of Agriculture home page, for example, has a link for jobs with the department. From that page, the user can click through to a page that lists jobs with the state of South Dakota. It would also be useful to provide links to the state home page, and to other relevant state agencies, as appropriate.

Feedback, Errors, and Omissions

If you would like to provide feedback (comments or suggestions), please contact the author. In particular, I would like to receive information on errors and omissions. For example, please advise if the name of the department with which you are affiliated is listed incorrectly. Also, if your web address changes, you are encouraged to notify the author. The plan is to update this rating guide periodically, and any assistance you provide will be appreciated.

Appendix A: Ratings for Web Sites of Land Grant Universities

Table A1: Alabama A & M University <http://www.aamu.edu/>


Overall Effectiveness:				
Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information	
3.33	3.67	3.67	4.00	
Comment #1: Pages are plain with not a lot of helpful information. Very minimal. Comment #2: This is a very creative and interactive website with nice organization. Comment #3: This site is a little plain looking, but has useful information.				

Table A2: University of Alaska, Fairbanks <http://www.uaf.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	3.33	4.67	4.33

Comment #1: Plain pages. Not visually stimulating. Contains plenty of information, though.

Comment #2: This is a well developed site that is geared toward current students, offering them access to common university information. **Comment #3:** It is a nice looking, functional website.

Table A3: Alcorn State University (Mississippi) <http://www.alcorn.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.33	2.33	4.00	3.33

Comment #1: Colors clash, but information is adequate. **Comment #2:** The "quick links" feature works very well with this site. **Comment #3:** In general, it is a good site. My computer is set to a large font, and the heading at the top of the home page wrapped around, which was confusing.


Table A4: University of Arizona <http://www.arizona.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
5.00	4.67	4.33	4.17

Comment #1: Home page nice. Other pages plain. **Comment #2:** The structure of this site is easy to follow with the help of descriptive headings that minimize the amount of searching time. **Comment #3:** This site is attractive and interesting.


Table A5: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville <http://www.uark.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	3.00	3.00	5.00

Comment #1: Lots of information, but lacking in visual appeal. Very plain pages. **Comment #2:** This website has poor organization, the titles and links are difficult to discern and do not follow a clear pattern. **Comment #3:** It's a good site, but kind of hard to find things.

Table A6: University of Arkansas Pine Bluff <http://www.uapb.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.00	4.67	3.50	4.17

Comment #1: Nice layout. Seems to be lacking in ease of finding information. **Comment #2:** This website has poor organization, the titles and links are difficult to discern and do not follow a clear pattern. **Comment #3:** It is a creatively designed site, but some of the pages seemed to jump around on the monitor.

Table A7: Auburn University (Alabama) <http://www.auburn.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	4.67	4.67	5.00

Comment #1: Very nice site. Looks professional. Neat and organized. All the information a student could ever need. **Comment #2:** This website provided a thorough illustration of the university and tied it all together with corresponding campus colors. **Comment #3:** This is a pleasant site. Lots of information.

Table A8: University of California, Berkeley www.berkeley.edu

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	5.00	4.33	5.00

Comment #1: Plain, but still very neat and appealing. Colorful and contains a lot of useful information. **Comment #2:** This website is very informative and the home page is an effective attention getting device. **Comment #3:** They did a fine job with this website.


Table A9: University of California, Davis <http://www.ucdavis.edu/index.html>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
5.00	4.67	4.33	5.00

Comment #1: A professional look and feel. Easy to navigate with a good content flow. **Comment #2:** This site provides in-depth information regarding the university which is utilized by students (current or prospective), faculty, staff, and researchers. **Comment #3:** The site is nice looking and has plenty of information.

Table A10: Clemson University (South Carolina) <http://www.clemson.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: : 


Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	3.50	4.00	4.33

Comment #1: Average looking site, but easy and interesting to navigate. Very organized.

Comment #2: This site provides good information but is slightly difficult to navigate.

Comment #3: It's a good site in general, but some of it loaded slowly and was not particularly easy to use.

Table A11: Colorado State University www.colostate.edu/

Overall Effectiveness: : 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.50	4.67	4.00	4.33

Comment #1: Bright coloring. Very organized and easy to find information. **Comment #2:**

The site is interactive with video and sound clips as well as rotating menu windows. **Comment #3:** The site is attractive, but a drawback is that I had to scroll down on some pages to get to the content.

Table A12: University of Connecticut <http://www.uconn.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.00	4.67	4.67	5.00

Comment #1: Beautiful site. Makes me want to go to school there. **Comment #2:** This website has very nice graphics and pictures and is organized in a user-friendly way. **Comment #3:** It is laid out in an organized way.

Table A13: Cornell University (New York) <http://www.cornell.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	5.00	4.67	5.00

Comment #1: Just about perfect. Couldn't think of how to improve. **Comment #2:** Loading time is quite slow due to photos and images. **Comment #3:** This is an attractive, inviting, and orderly site.

Table A14: University of Delaware <http://www.udel.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
5.00	5.00	4.67	4.67

Comment #1: Professional and informative. Layout is very impressive and visual appeal is great. **Comment #2:** This site is organized nicely and is offers a lot of useful information.

Comment #3: The web site is attractive and practical.

Table A15: Delaware State University <http://www.desu.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.00	4.33	4.33	4.67

Comment #1: Neat and organized. Lots of good information. **Comment #2:** A very good site with time saving links from A-Z, to campus information. **Comment #3:** Generally, a nice site, but the pages are too similarly laid out.

Table A16: University of the District of Columbia <http://www.universityofdc.org/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	3.00	4.00	4.00

Comment #1: Mostly text with no appeal whatsoever. **Comment #2:** This is an innovative site with a well planned structure. **Comment #3:** The site seemed amateurish. Example: different fonts in one list and typographical errors.

Table A17: University of Florida <http://www.ufl.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	4.00	4.33	4.33

Comment #1: Lots of information. Very quick loading. More pictures would be nice.

Comment #2: The links provided in text descriptions are useful. **Comment #3:** The site is pretty useful, but I experienced an error trying to load the campus map from the home page.

Table A18: Florida A&M University <http://www.famu.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.00	3.50	3.67	4.00

Comment #1: Nice site, but lacks curb appeal. Good information. **Comment #2:** This is a good site with effective drop down menus that appear by positioning the mouse over a heading. **Comment #3:** It's a good website, but I had some problems with links on the Division of Research page..

Table A19: Fort Valley State University (Georgia) <http://www.fvsu.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	2.33	4.00	4.00

Comment #1: Visual appeal needs some help. Otherwise, contains adequate information. **Comment #2:** This is a plain site but contains basic information. **Comment #3:** This is quite an attractive and useful site.

Table A20: University of Georgia <http://www.uga.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	3.83	3.67	4.33

Comment #1: Fast loading for so many pictures. Layout is clean and concise. **Comment #2:** This site is also plain but does have interactive menus that increase functionality. **Comment #3:** It's an attractive site, but too "newsy." Plus, I had to click to two different pages to get a story, and I had a problem with the virtual tour.

Table A21: University of Guam www.uog.edu

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	3.83	3.67	3.67

Comment #1: Information is lacking, but visually looks decent. **Comment #2:** The quick links is a nice feature that enhances the navigation of the site. **Comment #3:** This is a useful site, but there are a few typographical errors.

Table A22: University of Hawaii System www.hawaii.edu

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	3.00	3.67	4.00

Comment #1: Site looks old and amateurish. Not what I would expect for a university.

Comment #2: This site provides access to ten campus home pages in addition to a lot of information. **Comment #3:** This site has some things going for it, but I don't particularly like the layout of the home page.

Table A23: University of Idaho www.uihome.uidaho.edu

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.00	5.00	4.67	5.00

Comment #1: Outstanding site. Clean, professional, informative and visually appealing.

Comment #2: A very nice site that is well organized and easy to use. **Comment #3:** This is a nice, visually appealing site.

Table A24: University of Illinois <http://www.uillinois.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00

Comment #1: Very professional. Mounds of information. **Comment #2:** A clearly organized site with good structure. **Comment #3:** They had the difficult task of representing three campuses, and they pulled it off nicely.


Table A25: Iowa State University <http://www.iastate.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	3.67	4.33	4.67

Comment #1: Neat and clean. Very organized. **Comment #2:** Slightly plain but gets message across. **Comment #3:** It is a good, basic, solid website.

Table A26: Kansas State University www.ksu.edu

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.33	2.33	3.33	4.33

Comment #1: Very plain, tired, and unimpressive. **Comment #2:** This is not an interesting site, although the necessary information is provided. **Comment #3:** The site is fine, but the role-over menus didn't work well with the large font settings on my computer.

Table A27: University of Kentucky www.uky.edu

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.00	3.00	4.00	4.33

Comment #1: Very plain. Needs more flavors. **Comment #2:** More space on web pages could have been utilized in a better way. **Comment #3:** The pull-down menus from the vertical tabs wouldn't go away, and the home page was not particularly visually appealing.

Table A28: Kentucky State University www.kysu.edu

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.00	4.67	4.67	4.67

Comment #1: Looks professional and very academic. **Comment #2:** The site index is a helpful feature in locating information in less time. **Comment #3:** It is an attractive, useful website.

Table A29: Langston University (Oklahoma) <http://www.lunet.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.33	3.50	3.67	4.00

Comment #1: Useful but basic. Looks like it hasn't been updated in quite a while. **Comment #2:** This site is well organized and offers basic information for students, faculty and staff. **Comment #3:** The site is a bit "bare bones." On my computer, for many of the pages, the basic template took up the majority of the screen.

Table A30: Lincoln University of Missouri <http://www.lincolnu.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
2.67	2.83	3.50	3.67

Comment #1: Cute site, but layout is very text-intensive. **Comment #2:** Provides a lot of useful information. **Comment #3:** An example of the amount of information available is the "undergraduate degrees offered" page. It hadn't been updated in more than two years, and only about a third of the degrees had links to the prospective programs. Out of four links attempted, two had moved and one said, "page not found."

Table A31: Louisiana State University www.lsu.edu/

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	3.67	4.33	4.67

Comment #1: Colorful yet needs a better design. **Comment #2:** This site looks nice and provides a lot of information. **Comment #3:** It has lots of interesting information and looks good.

Table A32: University of Maine <http://www.umaine.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.00	4.00	4.00	4.67

Comment #1: Slow loading. Very basic layout. **Comment #2:** The alternating pictures on the home page are a good way to attract attention. **Comment #3:** In general, it is a nice site. The alumni page loaded slowly however, and the pop-up ad on the athletics page was annoying.

Table A33: University of Maryland <http://www.umd.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.00	3.67	4.00	4.00

Comment #1: Small layout. Simple, but effective. **Comment #2:** The drop down menus are effective and the site has good organization. **Comment #3:** The excessive use of animation was distracting and precluded the use of the back button. Use of the slogan "Fear the Turtle" tended to make the site seem less professional.

Table A34: University of Massachusetts, Amherst <http://www.umass.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	4.00	3.67	4.00

Comment #1: Slow loading due to the graphics presented. Otherwise average, but not too bad.

Comment #2: There are several typos in this site but it provides a lot of information in a good format. **Comment #3:** The site is adequate, but some of the fonts ran together because I had my computer set to have large fonts.

Table A35: Michigan State University www.msu.edu

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.17	4.67	4.33	5.00

Comment #1: Fast loading. Easy to look at. **Comment #2:** This is a good site with clear organization. **Comment #3:** It is a nice looking site, logically laid out, and easy to use.

Table A36: University of Minnesota www.umn.edu

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.00	4.33	3.67	4.33

Comment #1: Good looking site. Quite a lot of text. **Comment #2:** A lot of information is provided but is somewhat difficult to navigate due to font size and color schemes. **Comment #3:** This site is acceptable, but I had problems finding some information.

Table A37: Mississippi State University www.msstate.edu

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.00	3.33	4.33	4.33

Comment #1: Slow loading. Not very appealing. **Comment #2:** The site index is lumped together with no separation which results in difficulty finding information. **Comment #3:** It seemed a bit slow loading and not too easy to use.

Table A38: University of Missouri-Columbia <http://www.missouri.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.33	3.33	3.67	4.67

Comment #1: Slow loading. Overall very average. **Comment #2:** Provides information for students in a well organized format. **Comment #3:** I liked the site. My only criticism is that parts of it seemed too informal. Example, "When engineers get lucky."

Table A39: Montana State University <http://www.montana.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.00	3.83	4.33	4.67

Comment #1: Nice looking. Clean and inviting. **Comment #2:** This site clearly communicates details about a variety of topics from current students to recent menus. **Comment #3:** This is an attractive site with a great deal of useful information.


Table A40: University of Nebraska-Lincoln www.unl.edu

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	4.67	4.33	5.00

Comment #1: Plain but very appealing and professional. **Comment #2:** Detailed quick links provide fast access to a variety of different topics. **Comment #3:** This is an attractive, well organized site.

Table A41: University of Nevada, Reno www.unr.edu

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
2.33	2.83	3.67	3.67

Comment #1: Painfully slow load time. Not a lot of graphics; text-intensive. **Comment #2:** The site map is kept simple which is useful in navigating the site. **Comment #3:** This site seemed a bit basic. One obvious problem was an Asian character where it didn't belong on the home page.

Table A42: University of New Hampshire <http://unhinfo.unh.edu/index.html>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.33	4.67	4.33	4.33

Comment #1: Slow loading, but worth it. Site looks very nice. **Comment #2:** The find it fast column is helpful in navigating the site. **Comment #3:** It is an adequate site. The caption on the photo on the home page was cut off however, because my computer was set to a large font.

Table A43: New Mexico State University <http://www.nmsu.edu>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.00	2.67	3.67	4.33

Comment #1: Loads quickly. Looks nice, but could have a little more to it. Easy to navigate. Well done. **Comment #2:** A very plain site that requires much navigation before reaching the information. **Comment #3:** It is a useful site but somewhat plain looking.

Table A44: North Carolina A&T State University <http://www.ncat.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	3.83	4.00	4.00

Comment #1: Home page looks great, but lacks simplicity in finding information. **Comment #2:** Effective menus make it easy to locate desired information. **Comment #3:** This is a nice site. It seems to make too much use of unattractive tables, though.

Table A45: North Carolina State University <http://www.ncsu.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	2.83	4.33	4.33

Comment #1: Very nice, but a bit usual. Looks like any other university website. **Comment #2:** This site is somewhat difficult to navigate, but it supplies all the necessary information that students, visitors, and staff need. **Comment #3:** This site is useful. One criticism is that most of the links of the "centennial campus" menu under "for corporate partners" didn't work.

Table A46: North Dakota State University <http://www.ndsu.nodak.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.00	3.33	4.33	5.00

Comment #1: Looks good, but standard. Easy to use, but nothing makes it stand out.

Comment #2: This is a well developed site with a lot of useful information. **Comment #3:** The site contains sufficient useful information, but isn't particularly attractive, and overuses acronyms (NAID, ALFI) without defining them.

Table A47: The Ohio State University <http://www.osu.edu/index.php>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	4.17	5.00	5.00

Comment #1: Home page is typical, but the campus maps really stand out! **Comment #2:** Even though this site is plain visually, the structural access to sub-links on home page is convenient and saves time. **Comment #3:** They have a high quality site. I like the way photos for the three lead stories rotated on the home page.

Table A48: Oklahoma State University <http://osu.okstate.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	4.67	4.33	5.00

Comment #1: Very nice, standard website. **Comment #2:** This site provides a lot of good information that's helpful for potential and current students. **Comment #3:** It's a good website. One criticism however, was that the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources page was slow to load.

Table A49: Oregon State University <http://oregonstate.edu>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	4.67	4.67	5.00

Comment #1: Very nice, but ordinary. **Comment #2:** This is a very good site. It is clearly organized and provides many useful links. **Comment #3:** This is an attractive and inviting site.

Table A50: Pennsylvania State University <http://www.psu.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	4.00	4.33	4.67

Comment #1: Great look. Not fantastic, but different than the everyday site structure.

Comment #2: Every page is different for this website. It lacks consistency. **Comment #3:** This site has it all. A cornucopia of information and a classy design.

Table A51: Prairie View A&M University (Texas) <http://www.pvamu.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	3.00	3.67	3.33

Comment #1: Site is useful, but has a very "closed in" look. Needs more photographs of the campus and campus life. **Comment #2:** This site seems to be lacking in the amount of information provided. **Comment #3:** The site is adequate, but kind of basic.

Table A52: University of Puerto Rico Mayaguez Campus <http://www.uprm.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	4.17	3.67	4.33

Comment #1: Layout looks nice, but the entire site is in Spanish. No English translation available. **Comment #2:** Some pages were in English and some in Spanish; I could not find a way to convert the entire site to English but otherwise a very nice site. **Comment #3:** It seemed to be a good website. It was hard for me to evaluate however, because it is in Spanish.

Table A53: Purdue University (Indiana) <http://www.purdue.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.33	4.00	4.00	4.67

Comment #1: Information overload, but otherwise impressive. **Comment #2:** I could not locate the site map which is a helpful feature for any website. **Comment #3:** It's a good site, but not too exciting.

Table A54: University of Rhode Island www.uri.edu


Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.00	2.67	3.33	3.33

Comment #1: Standard site. Layout and information were easy to understand and acquire.

Comment #2: This site is well organized and provides the basic information necessary for students, but is a bit plain. **Comment #3:** The site seems to have the required information; a lot of the pages within it, however, looked very similar.

Table A55: Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey www.rutgers.edu

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.33	4.33	3.67	4.00

Comment #1: Love the snow! The photos make the university look very appealing. **Comment #2:** This site provides access to three related campuses. **Comment #3:** The site is adequate, but it could be made more attractive and easier to use.

Table A56: South Carolina State University <http://www.scsu.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	2.67	3.33	3.67

Comment #1: Very plain site, but good information. **Comment #2:** This is a good site, but it is a bit plain. **Comment #3:** A lot of the pages looked the same, and I experienced some broken links.

Table A57: South Dakota State University <http://www3.sdstate.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	4.00	4.33	4.67

Comment #1: Layout is organized, clean, and most importantly, unique. Information is easy to acquire and the site is inviting. **Comment #2:** This site provides a lot of good information that is easy to access. **Comment #3:** The site isn't too visually appealing and seems slow loading.

Table A58: Southern University and A&M College (Louisiana) <http://www.subr.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.33	4.33	4.33	4.00

Comment #1: Good looking site. Well organized. **Comment #2:** This site is a bit light on the quantity of information but has good graphics. **Comment #3:** This site is visually appealing and has lots of information. There was a large amount of white space on the home page, however, when viewed from my computer settings.

Table A59: University of Tennessee <http://www.utk.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	4.50	4.67	4.67

Comment #1: Very organized and visually appealing. **Comment #2:** This site is well organized and easy to navigate. **Comment #3:** The site is helpful, attractive, and easy to use. I experienced a broken link, however. ("Agricultural and Extension Education", from the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources academic programs page).

Table A60: Tennessee State University <http://www.tnstate.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	4.33	4.33	4.00

Comment #1: Standard looking site. Useful and practical. **Comment #2:** This site is nice, easy to navigate, and provides thorough information about the school. **Comment #3:** This is a nice looking site that is easy to use.


Table A61: Texas A&M University <http://www.tamu.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	3.67	4.00	4.67

Comment #1: Ordinary but clean. Information is relatively easy to find. **Comment #2:** This site is very creative and well organized. **Comment #3:** It has lots of news and information, but isn't especially visually appealing. For example, the fonts were not consistent on the "student" page under "facts and stats."

Table A62: Tuskegee University (Alabama) <http://www.tuskegee.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.00	4.00	4.67	4.67

Comment #1: Organized. Neat. Contains a lot of useful information. **Comment #2:** This website seemed to advertise itself as proof that students should want to go there, although the rotating window of upcoming events is a very good/effective idea. **Comment #3:** The site is attractive and has many news items.

Table A63: Utah State University <http://www.usu.edu>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	4.67	5.00	5.00

Comment #1: Everything is great. Content is easy to find and layout is ordinary, but useful. **Comment #2:** This is one of the most innovative sites that I have visited. The organization and features are different from the rest and very effective. **Comment #3:** This website is well done, attractive, and easy to use. It is interesting without being overly flashy and is a pleasure to visit.

Table A64: University of Vermont www.uvm.edu

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.00	3.00	3.67	4.67

Comment #1: Easy to navigate, good information, but ordinary. **Comment #2:** This is a good site but is a little difficult to navigate. **Comment #3:** The site has some good characteristics, e.g., lots of useful information. It doesn't appeal to me visually, though, and it was somewhat difficult to find things.

Table A65: University of the Virgin Islands <http://www.uvi.edu>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.33	3.00	4.00	4.33

Comment #1: Useful but not at all appealing. **Comment #2:** This site provides good information in a well organized way. **Comment #3:** The site accomplished what it needed to. It was somewhat slow to load however, and only moderately visually appealing.

Table A66: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University <http://www.vt.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
5.00	4.00	4.00	4.33

Comment #1: Layout isn't as clear as other sites. **Comment #2:** This site provides an in-depth look at the university and all that it has to offer. **Comment #3:** They have a nice site. My only criticism is that the Center for Survey Research had a lot of links that were under construction.

Table A67: Virginia State University <http://www.vsu.edu/pages/1.asp>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	4.00	4.00	4.67

Comment #1: Clean and fast loading. Information is available and attractive. **Comment #2:** The site presents the basic information about the institution in a fairly bland format, but it is functional for users. **Comment #3:** This is a nice website. The large blocks of text on some pages were hard to read, however.

Table A68: Washington State University <http://www.wsu.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	4.00	4.67	5.00

Comment #1: Functional but ordinary. **Comment #2:** This is a very good site; it is easy to find what you are looking for and keep track of your location within the site. **Comment #3:** It's a visually appealing site that conveys a sense of excitement.

Table A69: West Virginia State University <http://www.wvstateu.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.00	4.33	4.67	5.00

Comment #1: Looks like everything else, but still different enough to be enjoyable. Information was easy to find. **Comment #2:** The content of this site is detailed and thorough. **Comment #3:** The site looks nice. It is easy to find things and contains lots of information.

Table A70: West Virginia University <http://www.wvu.edu>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.00	3.83	4.33	5.00

Comment #1: Nice but ordinary. **Comment #2:** This site looks nice and provides a lot of useful information. **Comment #3:** The website made the university seem interesting and the campus/community seem inviting.

Table A71: University of Wisconsin-Madison <http://www.wisc.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.00	3.33	5.00	4.67

Comment #1: Beautiful school. The site really shows off the natural settings well. **Comment #2:** This site has a slide show to explain and/or promote the university. **Comment #3:** It is not very attractive, just layers of tables and lists.

Table A72: University of Wyoming www.uwyo.edu

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	4.00	4.33	4.00

Comment #1: Website looks good. Presents a functional and attractive look at the campus. **Comment #2:** While this site is visually appealing, it does not seem to provide that much detailed content. **Comment #3:** This is an easy to use website. Well organized.

Appendix B: Ratings for Web Sites of Departments of Agricultural Economics (or Equivalent) at Land Grant Universities

Table B1: Alabama A & M University: Department of Agribusiness
<http://saes.aamu.edu/agb/agbIndex.html>


Overall Effectiveness:				
Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information	
4.67	2.67	3	3.33	
Comment #1: The page had average visual appeal. Comment #2: This site provides some good information; however, some navigation is necessary in order to access it. Additionally, the layout and visual appeal could be improved. Comment #3: The web site is adequate but not outstanding. They didn't list the classes required for their graduate degrees. The only masters theses posted were from 2004.				

Table B2: University of Arizona: Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics
<http://ag.arizona.edu/arec/>


Overall Effectiveness:				
Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information	
4	2	3.33	4.67	
Comment #1: Information is plentiful, but navigation isn't as well done as it could be. Multiple pop-up navigation menus detract from the overall experience. Comment #2: This site offers information about the department and related programs/research in a user friendly way. Comment #3: This site has lots of information. The fonts are set large on my computer, and the home page didn't display clearly (overlapping text.) Also, the site map link didn't work.				

Table B3: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville: Department of Agricultural Economics and Agribusiness
<http://www.uark.edu/depts/agriecon/>


Overall Effectiveness:				
Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information	
4.67	3.33	4.33	4.67	
Comment #1: A lot of useful information, but the layout is taxing. The wide columns make the large amount of text difficult to read. Comment #2: This site has a nice structure that allows quick access to available information. Comment #3: This site provides lots of information and is easy to use.				

Table B4: Auburn University: Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology
<http://www.ag.auburn.edu/dept/aec/aec.html>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4	2	3.33	3.67

Comment #1: Interesting layout ideas, but the multiple colors and multiple looks just don't work. Information is easy to come by, but sub-pages are not uniform in style. A consistent look would go over very well here. **Comment #2:** This site has a simple format that contributes to the ease of navigation. **Comment #3:** This site is not very visually appealing. They list acronyms for their degrees (MBAA and MBAN) without defining them.

Table B5: University of California, Berkeley: Agricultural and Resource Economics Department
<http://are.berkeley.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	2.33	4	4

Comment #1: For such a well-known school, this website is one of the most ordinary of all the schools I've seen. Information is easy to find, but the visual appeal needs drastic help. **Comment #2:** This site presents the data and information effectively. **Comment #3:** There is a great deal of information, but it didn't seem like effort was made to make it visually appealing or easy to use. Also, some links did not work.

Table B6: University of California, Davis: Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics
<http://www.agecon.ucdavis.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
5	3	4.67	5

Comment #1: Extensive and updated, but visual appeal is basic and somewhat lacking. **Comment #2:** This website is good and provides useful information about the department. **Comment #3:** It's a good web site: well organized, lots of information, easy to use.

Table B7: Clemson University (South Carolina): Agricultural Economics Department
http://cherokee.agecon.clemson.edu/u_grad1.htm


Overall Effectiveness: 			
Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	2.33	4.67	4
Comment #1: The layout is plain but not unappealing. Information is plentiful and easy to find. Comment #2: Site is limited in the major areas of focus, providing only general program and student information. Comment #3: The layout of the site is very basic, and not visually appealing.			

Table B8: Colorado State University: Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics
<http://dare.agsci.colostate.edu/csuaecon/default.htm>


Overall Effectiveness: 			
Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4	3.67	4.67	4
Comment #1: The site has an inviting layout, which is consistent throughout. Comment #2: This site provides a good description of the department and is organized well, but lacks a sufficient amount of useful data. Comment #3: They have a nice web site. They should include some links on the "Links" page, however.			

Table B9: University of Connecticut: Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics
<http://www.are.uconn.edu/>


Overall Effectiveness: 			
Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3	2	3.67	3.67
Comment #1: Slow load time, and visual appeal is very poor. Looks like a first generation site. Information is easy to find. Comment #2: There are many practical outside links offered by this site, but the quantity of information is limited. Comment #3: It is not very visually appealing. Following are some broken links I encountered: UCONN Visitor Information, "map location" on "Map to the W.B. Young Building."			

Table B10: Cornell University: Department of Applied Economics and Management
<http://aem.cornell.edu/>


Overall Effectiveness: 			
Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	4.33	4.67	4.67
Comment #1: A text-heavy layout leads to a very business-like feel. Information is extensive.			
Comment #2: An innovative site that covers related department and agricultural issues.			
Comment #3: It's high quality in all respects, visually appealing, lots of information, easy to use, etc.			

Table B11: University of Delaware: Department of Food and Resource Economics
<http://ag.udel.edu/frec/>


Overall Effectiveness: 			
Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	5	4.67	4.67
Comment #1: The look of the site was simple, but very attractive and different than comparable sites. Information was easy to find, and for the most part, plentiful.			
Comment #2: This site provides access to a wide range of research topics and data.			
Comment #3: There is lots of information here; easy to use. I liked the "Student Profile" feature.			

Table B12: University of Florida: Food and Resource Economics Department
<http://www.fred.ifas.ufl.edu/>


Overall Effectiveness: 			
Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	4.33	4	5
Comment #1: Load time and visual appeal are good. Some links went to non-existent pages.			
Comment #2: This site looks nice and offers many useful links to centers, programs, and research data.			
Comment #3: It's generally a user-friendly and useful site. They had a couple of instructors' names mixed up on the course syllabus page, however. Plus, I suggest they list the faculty members' specialties on the directory.			

Table B13: Fort Valley State University (Georgia): Department of Agricultural Economics
http://www.fvsu.edu/coaheap/ag_econ.asp

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	2.33	3	3

Comment #1: Information is plentiful and useful, but the menu style and harsh colors detract from the enjoyment of the site. **Comment #2:** Navigation of this site is difficult due to the color and font type, and it also provides a limited amount of data. **Comment #3:** It consists of only one page. They need to add more information, e.g., a separate page for each faculty member.

Table B14: University of Georgia: Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics
<http://www.agecon.uga.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.33	3.67	4.33	4.67

Comment #1: Information is generally easy to find, but web pages are not uniform. The home page works and is very colorful, but almost to the point of being distracting. **Comment #2:** This site contains detailed material that is easy to locate as a result of good organization. **Comment #3:** This site has a great deal of information. Some pages were slow to load, however.

Table B15: University of Idaho: Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology
<http://www.ag.uidaho.edu/aers/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	5	4	4.33

Comment #1: A very nice layout with clean, consistent menus is hindered only by a menu system with a few extra clicks than necessary. **Comment #2:** This website is very informative and provides substantial amount data/reports. **Comment #3:** They have a great foundation for a web site. It would be nice if they made it clearer what the links are.

Table B16: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign: Department of Agricultural and Consumer Economics

<http://www.ace.uiuc.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	4.33	4	4.67

Comment #1: Overall a very clean and professional looking site. Information is easy to find without overwhelming the user. **Comment #2:** Accessing relevant information is difficult because the site lacks clear, defined menus/links. **Comment #3:** This is a nice and useful website. Their "Employment Opportunities" page was particularly helpful.

Table B17: Iowa State University: Department of Economics

<http://www.econ.iastate.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4	2.67	4.67	4.67

Comment #1: Standard site. Nothing flashy or particularly interesting. Menus are easy to follow, and the information is quickly obtained. **Comment #2:** This website shows consistency resulting in faster, more efficient navigation. **Comment #3:** It has a simple design, but it is elegant. I suggest they add some more links.

Table B18: Kansas State University: Agricultural Economics Department

www.agecon.ksu.edu/home/homepage.htm

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	4.33	4.33	4.67

Comment #1: Site layout and appeal isn't too bad. Information is easy to find without being overwhelming. **Comment #2:** This site contains detailed material and links to other related sites in an appealing form. **Comment #3:** This is a very good site. The only criticisms I have is that it wasn't easy to find a list of the faculty, or who the department chair is.

Table B19: University of Kentucky: Department of Agricultural Economics
<http://www.uky.edu/Ag/AgEcon/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time

4

Visual Appeal

2.67

Ease of Navigation

4

Quantity of Useful
Information

4.33

Comment #1: Fast loading, useful information, and easy to get around. However, the old and visually unappealing layout is a big drawback. **Comment #2:** This site is average but does contain a lot of data and links to other sources. **Comment #3:** The site is functional and it does what it is supposed to do. It is not particularly visually appealing, however.

Table B20: Louisiana State University: Department of Agricultural Economics and Agribusiness
<http://www.agecon.lsu.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time

5

Visual Appeal

2

Ease of Navigation

3.33

Quantity of Useful
Information

3.67

Comment #1: A very unimpressive layout filled with links which look like regular text. Hard to tell what leads to other pages and what does not. **Comment #2:** This site contains a good deal of information and links covering a variety of topics. **Comment #3:** The home page is basically text. There is no apparent logic to how it's organized.

Table B21: University of Maine: Department of Resource Economics and Policy
<http://www.ume.maine.edu/~rep/rep.htm>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time

3.67

Visual Appeal

4

Ease of Navigation

3.67

Quantity of Useful
Information

4.33

Comment #1: Slow loading, visually unappealing, and a less-than-ideal navigation system pull down what should be a professional look at a professional program. **Comment #2:** The publications provide information related to current issues in addition to the general department material. **Comment #3:** The web site is adequate. It isn't very easy to find some information, and it's not particularly visually appealing. The link for "Seminars" was out of date.

Table B22: University of Maryland: Agricultural and Resource Economics Department
<http://www.arec.umd.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	3.67	4.33	4

Comment #1: An unappealing layout with a lot of plain text, tables, etc. Information available seems minimal. **Comment #2:** This is a well developed, easy to navigate department page. **Comment #3:** There is a lot of information in this easy to use site. Using smaller blocks of text, however, would be an improvement.

Table B23: University of Massachusetts, Amherst: Department of Resource Economics
<http://www.umass.edu/resec/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
5	3.33	4.67	5

Comment #1: A decent site full of useful and easy-to-find information. The visual appeal isn't great, but not horrible either. **Comment #2:** The shortcuts section of this site is a helpful feature that reduces searching time. **Comment #3:** The site seemed to have everything you might need. The faculty pages were particularly informative.

Table B24: Michigan State University: Department of Agricultural Economics
www.aec.msu.edu/agecon/

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	4	4	4.33

Comment #1: Standard and functional, but nothing special. **Comment #2:** Resources pertaining to academics, research projects, and department information are available at this site. **Comment #3:** The site contains lots of useful and up-to-date information, and is visually appealing.

Table B25: University of Minnesota: Department of Applied Economics
www.apec.umn.edu


Overall Effectiveness: 			
Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	4.67	4	4.33
Comment #1: I found it difficult to find what I was looking for. The visual appeal is decent, but nothing too exciting. Comment #2: Academic programs, research projects, and department information are thoroughly discussed within this site. Comment #3: This is a professional looking site with possibly the largest quantity of information available among sites of this category.			

Table B26: Mississippi State University: Department of Agricultural Economics
<http://www.agecon.msstate.edu/>


Overall Effectiveness: 			
Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	3.33	4.33	4.67
Comment #1: Plenty of good information, but the layout looks thrown together and unfinished. Comment #2: This site is an interactive, detailed source that offers information on various aspects of the department. Comment #3: This site is adequate, but not particularly visually appealing.			

Table B27: University of Missouri-Columbia: Department of Agricultural Economics
<http://www.ssu.missouri.edu/AgEcon/>


Overall Effectiveness: 			
Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4	3.33	4	3.33
Comment #1: An average site with easily obtained information in a standard layout. Comment #2: This site is a narrow presentation of the department and related topics. Comment #3: The site is adequate, but has some limitations. It's not very visually appealing. The information listed on the faculty pages is not consistent.			

Table B28: Montana State University: Department of Agricultural Economics and Economics
<http://www.montana.edu/econ/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	3.67	4.67	4

Comment #1: An average site with easily obtained information and a standard layout.

Comment #2: A well developed site that provides information on various topics related to the department. **Comment #3:** They have a useful, visually appealing web site. It would be an improvement if they get their working paper archive up and update their seminar schedule.

Table B29: University of Nebraska-Lincoln: Department of Agricultural Economics
<http://agecon.unl.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	2.67	4	4.67

Comment #1: Useful enough, but not overly interesting. The visual appeal is low as the layout looks like it has not been updated for years. **Comment #2:** The resources, overview and popular publications are nice features that complement the overall structure of the site.

Comment #3: The web site is nice, with lots of information, but layout could be improved.

Table B30: University of Nevada, Reno: Department of Resource Economics
<http://www.cabnr.unr.edu/re>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3	4	3.67	3.67

Comment #1: Refreshingly professional looking layout. The information is plentiful and each page is easy to look at. **Comment #2:** Overall, it appears to be a good resource; however, it lacks depth of material and relevant links. **Comment #3:** It is a visually appealing web site. The "About" link on the home page didn't work, however, and they have no directory of graduate students or job listings.

Table B31: University of New Hampshire: Department of Resource Economics and Development

<http://www.dred.unh.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.33	2	3.67	3.33

Comment #1: Visual appeal is low, content is standard. The site is saved by a somewhat interesting photo gallery. **Comment #2:** This department page is very clean, but provides inadequate descriptions for a limited range of data. **Comment #3:** I feel the web site needs some time and effort spent to improve it. It isn't particularly visually appealing.

Table B32: New Mexico State University: Department of Agricultural Economics and Agricultural Business

<http://spectre.nmsu.edu/dept/welcome.html?t=aeab>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	3.33	5	4.33

Comment #1: Overall, the site is clean, professional, and uniform. Information is standard and each page loads slower than it should considering the heavy emphasis on text and small graphics. **Comment #2:** The presentation of material is focused mainly on issues affecting New Mexico. **Comment #3:** The site is simple, yet functional, and easy to use.

Table B33: North Carolina A&T State University: Department of Agribusiness, Applied Economics and Agriscience Education

<http://www.ag.ncat.edu/agribusiness/index.html>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	3.33	3.67	4

Comment #1: Site looks good, but menu effects look almost transparent. This leads to difficulty in reading the menus to know where to go for information. **Comment #2:** A list of research topics is presented, but there is no corresponding explanatory material. **Comment #3:** It provides basic information. It isn't particularly visually appealing and it doesn't have a great deal of content.

Table B34: North Carolina State University: Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics

<http://www.ag-econ.ncsu.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	2.67	4.33	4.33

Comment #1: Visual appeal is very ordinary. More colors and a better layout would help a lot. **Comment #2:** This site contains access to full length reports which are beneficial for related research projects. **Comment #3:** The web site is functional with lots of information. It could be more visually appealing, though.

Table B35: North Dakota State University: Department of Agribusiness and Applied Economics

<http://www.ext.nodak.edu/homepages/aedept/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	3.67	3.33	4.67

Comment #1: Loads quickly, looks nice, but could have a little more to it. Navigation could be made clearer and more inviting. **Comment #2:** Students are supplied with general information regarding the department, and there is also access to data covering various agriculture related topics. **Comment #3:** The web site is adequate. The design isn't too sophisticated, and it wasn't easy to get the links to work on the home page.

Table B36: The Ohio State University: Department of Agricultural, Environmental, and Development Economics

<http://www-agecon.ag.ohio-state.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	3	4.67	4.33

Comment #1: A nice site with an unusual look and feel for a university. Looks almost like a sales brochure. Links are large and easy find, and information is plentiful. Site is easy to read. **Comment #2:** This is a good source of external agriculture related links. **Comment #3:** In general, it is a good site with lots of information. A couple of problems were 1) some of the fonts were not legible (because I have the fonts set to be large on my computer) and 2) the page for the Andersons Chair was out of date.

Table B37: Oklahoma State University: Department of Agricultural Economics
<http://agecon.okstate.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.33	3.67	4.33	4.67

Comment #1: Very attractive site with an unusual but effective layout. Information is easy to find. **Comment #2:** This site is very informative and effectively communicates the main issues of the department. **Comment #3:** While this site has plenty of useful information, I didn't like the way it looks and it wasn't easy for me to use. I had to scroll down to see the relevant content.

Table B38: Oregon State University: Agricultural and Resource Department
<http://arec.oregonstate.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	4.33	4.33	4.67

Comment #1: Layout isn't the best, but it's very well done as a whole. Information is easy to find and plentiful. **Comment #2:** This site provides a comprehensive set of topics geared toward current students. **Comment #3:** I had to scroll to the right to view the home page. I suggest they add information about graduate students and a separate link for publications (instead of listing them under "Welcome").

Table B39: Pennsylvania State University: Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology
<http://www.aers.psu.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	2.67	4	4.67

Comment #1: An ordinary layout detracts from an otherwise very useful site. **Comment #2:** The main research topics are common issues for many and are complete with specific details. **Comment #3:** It isn't very visually appealing and some of the information looked out of date.

Table B40: Purdue University: Department of Agricultural Economics
www.agecon.purdue.edu (Ag. Econ.)


Overall Effectiveness: 			
Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4	4	5	5
Comment #1: Slow load with an uninspiring but clean layout. Information is useful and easy to find. A layout overhaul would be beneficial. Comment #2: A well developed site with access to numerous sources of information. Comment #3: They have a high quality, informative website. I enjoyed the department history information.			

Table B41: University of Rhode Island: Department of Environmental and Natural Resource Economics
<http://www.uri.edu/cels/enre/ie.html>


Overall Effectiveness: 			
Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	3	4	4
Comment #1: Something about the look of the site puts me to sleep while looking at it. Comment #2: This site lacks a collection of specific data but does have access to important links. Comment #3: I didn't like the way most of the web site was fixed, and there was only a small space that changed as I clicked on links.			

Table B42: Rutgers - the State University of New Jersey: Department of Agricultural, Food, and Resource Economics
<http://www.dafre.rutgers.edu/>


Overall Effectiveness: 			
Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4	4	3.67	4.33
Comment #1: Although the visual appeal isn't fantastic, it is very clean and professional. Each sub-page loads into the same window and follows a uniform layout. Interesting information offers more than the bare bones to readers. Comment #2: The information provided for this department lacks clear organization and ease of navigation is reduced. Comment #3: They have a good start for a web site. I encountered a few problems, however. The "Ag marketing publications" link on the home page resulted in "page not found." Both the "News and Events" page and the "Seminars" page were under construction.			

Table B43: South Carolina State University: Department of Accounting, Agribusiness, and Economics

<http://www.scsu.edu/Academics/Colleges/Departments/index.cfm?ID=6>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	3.33	4	3

Comment #1: The site appears to be lacking in information. A simple layout is not too unappealing and the overall presentation is pleasant. **Comment #2:** Main focus is on programs and brief descriptions that are offered through the department. **Comment #3:** It didn't seem to have a lot of information. For example, I couldn't find a list of the faculty.

Table B44: South Dakota State University: Department of Economics

<http://econ.sdstate.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	2.67	4	2.33

Comment #1: Very simple layout with the basic information. **Comment #2:** This site effectively describes the graduate and undergraduate programs available. **Comment #3:** The site is not too visually appealing, and it doesn't have a lot of information. To get any information on a faculty member beyond his/her name, you have to click to another page.

Table B45: University of Tennessee: Department of Agricultural Economics

<http://economics.ag.utk.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
5	4.67	4.33	5

Comment #1: For a department site, the layout and visual appeal is fantastic. Information is plentiful and easy to find. Menus are attractive and function well. **Comment #2:** This site is well organized and easy to navigate. **Comment #3:** This site is well organized, visually appealing, and has lots of information.

Table B46: Texas A&M University: Department of Agricultural Economics
<http://agecon.tamu.edu/>


Overall Effectiveness: 			
Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4	4.67	5	5
Comment #1: One of the best department sites seen yet. A very professional and attractive layout leads the readers directly to their destination. Well done. Comment #2: A well organized site with access to archived department publications. Comment #3: I enjoyed visiting this web site. It is well thought out and has a lot of information.			

Table B47: Utah State University: Department of Economics
<http://www.econ.usu.edu/>


Overall Effectiveness: 			
Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	4.67	4	4.67
Comment #1: Above average visual appeal adds to the wealth of information offered by this well-designed site. Comment #2: This site provides a limited amount of data, but communicates main messages/ideas successfully. Comment #3: This is a nice looking web site that met all of my expectations. I didn't like the delay in searching the sub menu after clicking on a main link from the home page, however.			

Table B48: University of Vermont: Department of Community Development and Applied Economics
<http://www.uvm.edu/~cdae/>


Overall Effectiveness: 			
Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	3.67	5	5
Comment #1: Layout is a bit blocky, but otherwise good. Information is plentiful and menus work as a helpful guide to the rest of the site. Comment #2: The list of relevant links is a nice feature to access specific topics and data. Comment #3: The site is very organized, easy-to-use, and has lots of information.			

Table B49: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University: Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics

<http://www.aaec.vt.edu/aaec/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	3	4.67	4.33

Comment #1: Site layout is well done and blends nicely with the university's main pages. Menus work well, making the plentiful information easy to find. **Comment #2:** This site provides an in-depth look at the university and all that it has to offer. **Comment #3:** The site is well organized, and has sufficient information, but isn't particularly visually appealing.

Table B50: Washington State University: School of Economic Sciences

<http://www.ses.wsu.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	4.33	3.67	4.33

Comment #1: A decent site is overshadowed by unclear navigation. Menus on the left lead to general school information, while only the tiny links at the bottom of the page are for department pages. **Comment #2:** This site contains a lot of data that can be applied to multiple areas of interest. **Comment #3:** It is a nice web site, visually appealing with much information.

Table B51: West Virginia University: Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics

<http://www.caf.wvu.edu/resm/are/index.html>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	3.67	4	4

Comment #1: A decent but standard site. Visual appeal is attractive but not outstanding. **Comment #2:** A very good site with many links to other sources of related material. **Comment #3:** I experienced a few broken links and had trouble finding some items. Besides that, it was OK.

Table B52: University of Wisconsin-Madison: Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics

<http://www.aae.wisc.edu/www/>

Overall Effectiveness:



Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4	3.33	4.33	5

Comment #1: A basic but useful layout. News is listed on the home page as is other pertinent information. **Comment #2:** This site is plain, but contains extensive material for a range of agriculture related topics. **Comment #3:** The site has lots of information, but it isn't very visually appealing or easy to use.

Table B53: University of Wyoming: Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics

<http://www.uwyo.edu/agecon/>

Overall Effectiveness:



Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	3.67	3.67	4.67

Comment #1: Good information is spread throughout the site, even though the layout is a bit blocky. This shows off the school and the department well. **Comment #2:** The drop-down menus are nice features that enhance the functionality of the site. **Comment #3:** The home page looks nice. I encountered a couple of broken links, however, ("Internships" from the home page and "Ag Help Wanted" from the publications page).

Appendix C: Ratings for Web Sites of State Departments of Agriculture

Table C1: Alabama Department of Agriculture and Industries www.agi.state.al.us/

Overall Effectiveness:



Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	2.33	3.67	4

Comment #1: Useful, but layout looks old. Information is often in PDF form, which could slow down older computers. **Comment #2:** Plain design without clear lines. **Comment #3:** Design of the home page is pretty unsophisticated. Well organized and lots of links to useful information.

Table C2: Alaska Department of Natural Resources Division of Agriculture
<http://www.dnr.state.ak.us/ag/>


Overall Effectiveness:								
Loading Time		Visual Appeal		Ease of Navigation		Quantity of Useful Information		
5		3		4.67		5		
Comment #1: Site looks a little stale, but it loads quickly, and the information is very easy to find. Comment #2: Nice design; information presented clearly; good flow throughout site. Comment #3: It is organized adequately, but the design is far too basic.								

Table C3: Arizona Department of Agriculture <http://agriculture.state.az.us/>


Overall Effectiveness:				
Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information	
4.67	4	4.33	5	
Comment #1: Layout is a bit stale, but it loads quickly and the information is very easy to find. Comment #2: Good organization of links. Comment #3: Nice overall web site: pleasant look, functional, and lots of information.				

Table C4: Arkansas State Plant Board <http://www.plantboard.org>


Overall Effectiveness:				
Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information	
4.67	3.67	4	3	
Comment #1: An easy site to navigate, but not very exciting or extensive. Comment #2: This site is visually appealing and provides links that the general public may commonly desire to access. Comment #3: The site is very basic. Because this is a plant board instead of a department of agriculture necessarily limits the amount of information provided (i.e., no information about animal industries). I noticed some typos.				

Table C5: California Department of Food and Agriculture
<http://www.cdffa.ca.gov/>


Overall Effectiveness:				
Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information	
2.67	4	4.67	5	
Comment #1: Slower loading than others. Useful information, standard layout.				
Comment #2: Excellent pictures/charts and abstracts for links. Comment #3: This is a well planned and designed website. Lots of info, and the slide show was an innovative and useful feature.				

Table C6: Colorado Department of Agriculture www.ag.state.co.us

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	3	3.33	3.67

Comment #1: Fast loading, but information isn't quite as easy to find as other sites.

Comment #2: Unable to click on some links available; setup slightly confusing.

Comment #3: Body of the home page looked bare. I had a problem with the drop-down menus across the top.

Table C7: State of Connecticut Department of Agriculture <http://www.ct.gov/doag>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	4.83	5	4.67

Comment #1: Fast loading, great layout. Looks better than your average government site.

Comment #2: Site showed consistency throughout; good organization.

Comment #3: It isn't spectacular, but looks nice and has very good functionality.

Table C8: Delaware Department of Agriculture <http://www.state.de.us/deptagri/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	3.33	4.33	4.33

Comment #1: Home page is clean and has a lot of links. This could be attractive to some, but overwhelming to others. **Comment #2:** Plain structure but it is clear what the site contains. **Comment #3:** There's too much blue on the home page. Having definitions pop up when you roll over the links is helpful.

Table C9: Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

<http://doacs.state.fl.us/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
5	4	5	5

Comment #1: Nice look and feel with a useful layout. The latest information is listed first. **Comment #2:** Dull colors but organized well with not too much information and good headings. **Comment #3:** This is a well planned and organized web site with lots of useful information.

Table C10: Georgia Department of Agriculture <http://www.agr.state.ga.us/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.33	3.33	4	4.67

Comment #1: Useful information, easy to find. Layout needs to be updated. **Comment #2:** Drop down menus and frequently accessed pages very effective. **Comment #3:** The long loading time for the home page detracts from its ease of use.

Table C11: Hawaii Department of Agriculture www.hawaiiag.org/hdoa/

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
5	4	4.33	5

Comment #1: Useful and relatively easy to navigate. Site is very text-heavy though. Pictures of Hawaii would be great. **Comment #2:** Very informative; good presentation. **Comment #3:** It is well-organized with lots of useful information.

Table C12: Idaho State Department of Agriculture www.agri.state.id.us

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	4	4.33	4.67

Comment #1: Useful, but nothing really stands out. **Comment #2:** Effective drop down menu with contents. **Comment #3:** It's a nice, functional web site.

Table C13: Illinois Department of Agriculture <http://www.agr.state.il.us/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4	4.67	4.33	4.33

Comment #1: Decent site, but very busy. **Comment #2:** The descriptions are too long, creating an unorganized appearance but otherwise good. **Comment #3:** A visually appealing site. It's professionally done with lots of information.

Table C14: Indiana State Department of Agriculture www.in.gov/oca/

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	3.67	4.67	4.33

Comment #1: General layout very fast and clean. Easy to find information. **Comment #2:** Contents too close together; not very effective. **Comment #3:** An adequate web site, but it seems to have a bureaucratic, rather than a creative or entrepreneurial, feel.


Table C15: Iowa Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship
<http://www.agriculture.state.ia.us>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.33	3	3.67	4.67

Comment #1: Easy and informative, but layout isn't uniform. **Comment #2:** Alphabetical organization works well to locate information quickly. **Comment #3:** The home page is basically three columns of text, and takes a long time to load. Also, the drop down menu is hard to read.

Table C16: Kansas Department of Agriculture <http://www.ksda.gov>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	4	4.33	4.67

Comment #1: Slow loading. Amount of text is overwhelming. **Comment #2:** Nicely organized but looks a bit cluttered. **Comment #3:** The "Quick Links," "How do I?" and "World News" features are innovative and helpful. There was a problem with a pop-up blocker, however.

Table C17: Kentucky Department of Agriculture <http://www.kyagr.com>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.67	4	3.67	4.67

Comment #1: Layout is clean, simple, and straight to the point. **Comment #2:** This site is not bad, but not that informative either. **Comment #3:** It's a nice looking and useful web site, but there are some navigation problems.

Table C18: Louisiana Department of Agriculture and Forestry <http://www.ldaf.state.la.us/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
5	4.33	4	4

Comment #1: Site is well done. Information is plentiful, easy to find and makes up for the lack of visual appeal. **Comment #2:** Contrasting colors look good, but the layout limits amount of useable space. **Comment #3:** The foundation for a great web site is there. They need to introduce the features on the home page, rather than giving a "coming soon" message.

Table C19: Maine Department of Agriculture, Food and Rural Resources
<http://www.maine.gov/agriculture/index.shtml>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3	4.33	4	5

Comment #1: Website loads slowly, but is otherwise strong and useful. **Comment #2:** Too many different fonts, appears cluttered. **Comment #3:** It's a nice web site with plenty of information, but there are some navigation problems.

Table C20: Maryland Department of Agriculture <http://www.mda.state.md.us/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	4.33	5	5

Comment #1: Clear and concise. Layout is clean but standard. Information is easy to find. **Comment #2:** Offers a lot of information in a well presented way. **Comment #3:** It's a nice looking and informative web site.

Table C21: Massachusetts Department of Agricultural Resources <http://www.mass.gov/agr/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	4	4.67	5

Comment #1: The site loads quickly and information is easy to find. Visual appeal is lacking due to no photographs. **Comment #2:** It lacks consistency throughout site, but good overall presentation of information. **Comment #3:** This site has it all...attractive and lots of information.

Table C22: Michigan Department of Agriculture www.michigan.gov/mda

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	5	4.67	5

Comment #1: Site is clean and attractive. New pages open in the same window, thus preventing needless desktop clutter. **Comment #2:** The site has an effective way to keep track of pages that have been examined. **Comment #3:** It's a professional-looking site, with lots of useful information.

Table C23: Minnesota Department of Agriculture www.mda.state.mn.us

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	3.33	4	4.67

Comment #1: Adequate, but nothing special. Looks like a government site. **Comment #2:** This is a very good site and is clearly organized. **Comment #3:** The site has a substantial amount of information, but it has a bureaucratic feel.

Table C24: Mississippi Department of Agriculture and Commerce
<http://www.mdac.state.ms.us/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4	5	4.67	4.67

Comment #1: Very nice site. Layout is clean and concise. New pages open in same window. **Comment #2:** Easy to follow format with drop down menu lists. **Comment #3:** Generally, it's a fine site, but it has some navigation problems.

Table C25: Missouri Department of Agriculture <http://www.mda.mo.gov/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
5	4	4.67	5

Comment #1: Everything is great. The visual appeal isn't too exciting, but it's attractive and inviting. **Comment #2:** Good representation of Missouri agriculture. **Comment #3:** It's nice looking, well organized, and has timely information.

Table C26: Montana Department of Agriculture <http://agr.state.mt.us/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4	3.67	5	4.67

Comment #1: Standard looking site, but very attractive and easy to navigate. **Comment #2:** Very simple design allows user to focus on data. **Comment #3:** The site is not too fancy, but it does what it is supposed to do.

Table C27: Nebraska Department of Agriculture www.agr.state.ne.us/

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	3.33	4.33	3.67

Comment #1: Productive site with useful information, but layout is very stale. **Comment #2:** This site is not that visually appealing but does provide good information that can be useful for agricultural participants and the general public. **Comment #3:** This is an adequate site, but some of the pages could have been designed so as to be more user-friendly.

Table C28: Nevada Department of Agriculture <http://agri.state.nv.us/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4	3.67	4	4.67

Comment #1: Everything is great, but the page layout is incredibly boring and uninviting. **Comment #2:** A nicely organized site with detailed contents displayed on every page. **Comment #3:** This site is just OK, but not spectacular.

Table C29: New Hampshire Department of Agriculture, Markets, and Food

<http://agriculture.nh.gov/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	4.67	4.67	4.67

Comment #1: Beautiful site. Layout and photographs look professional without a long load time. Information is plentiful and easy to acquire. **Comment #2:** Very clean site with logical organization. **Comment #3:** It is a good web site; it doesn't seem very creative, however.

Table C30: New Jersey Department of Agriculture www.state.nj.us/agriculture

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	3.67	4.33	4

Comment #1: Layout appeal fluctuates from very boring to very nice. Information is easy to find and layout is logical. **Comment #2:** This site is decent, but not the best.

Comment #3: The site has substantial and useful content, but it isn't too visually appealing or easy to use.

Table C31: New Mexico Department of Agriculture <http://nmdaweb.nmsu.edu/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	3.67	5	4.67

Comment #1: An informative site with decent information. Layout really needs updating. **Comment #2:** A good site, just a little plain. **Comment #3:** The site is easy to use and has lots of useful information.

Table C32: New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets
<http://www.agmkt.state.ny.us/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	4.33	4	4.33

Comment #1: Disappointing layout for such a well-known state. **Comment #2:** This site is colorful and attractive and provides a lot of data that can be utilized by agricultural producers and consumers. **Comment #3:** In general, it is a good web site. The fact that the link to the commissioner's "State of Agriculture" address was broken and there were no press releases posted for 2005 (as of 02/06/05) spoiled the effect.

Table C33: North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
<http://www.agr.state.nc.us/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	4.33	4.67	5

Comment #1: Website layout is standard. Content is clear and easy to find. **Comment #2:** This site has good structure and design. **Comment #3:** This is an attractive, well organized site with plenty of information.

Table C34: North Dakota Department of Agriculture <http://www.agdepartment.com/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
2.67	2.67	3.33	4

Comment #1: The site is very plain. Its layout detracts from an otherwise useful presentation. **Comment #2:** Good pictures and layout but menus slightly unclear.

Comment #3: Notable characteristics affecting its rating include: over prominent photo of the commissioner on the home page, lack of clear information regarding "who we are" and "what we do" for some program areas, "about us" link went to an "under construction" page.

Table C35: Ohio Department of Agriculture <http://www.ohioagriculture.gov/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	4	5	5

Comment #1: Not visually appealing, but very simple to navigate with very useful information. **Comment #2:** Very appealing and easy to find what you are looking for.

Comment #3: This is a good website with lots of information.

Table C36: Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry

<http://www.oda.state.ok.us/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4	3.67	3.33	4.33

Comment #1: Standard layout. More difficult to find information than other sites.

Comment #2: Effective site with clear menu headings. **Comment #3:** The way the header material is locked on the monitor detracts from its visual appeal, and ease of use. Some of the county sheriffs did not have their last names listed.

Table C37: Oregon Department of Agriculture <http://egov.oregon.gov/ODA/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	5	4.33	4.33

Comment #1: Fast loading and professional looking. Information is behind a few more clicks than it might need to be. **Comment #2:** This site looks very professional and is easy to use. **Comment #3:** The web site was nice looking with good information, but slow to load and not too easy to use.

Table C38: Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture <http://www.agriculture.state.pa.us/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	4.67	4.33	4.67

Comment #1: Attractive layout. Loads quickly. Information is easy to find. **Comment #2:** Thorough menus and professional presentation of information. **Comment #3:** The site has plenty of information and is well organized.

Table C39: Puerto Rico Department of Agriculture
<http://www.agricultura.gobierno.pr/main.asp>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.66	4.66	3	3.33

Comment #1: Visually appealing and colorful. Difficult to tell if content is abundant due to it being in Spanish. **Comment #2:** The site looks nice. It would be helpful, however, if they would include some material in English. **Comment #3:** This site is very appealing visually, although it is difficult to discern the quantity of useful data due to the fact that the site is in Spanish.

Table C40: Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management
<http://www.state.ri.us/dem/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4	5	4.33	4.33

Comment #1: Very nice site. Colorful, clean, and information is easy to come by. **Comment #2:** Very nice design on home page but other pages cluttered. **Comment #3:** They did well considering the size of the state and the amount of resources likely to be available for agriculture.

Table C41: South Carolina Department of Agriculture <http://www.scdas.state.sc.us/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
2.33	3.33	4.33	4.33

Comment #1: Everything but the load time and visual appeal is great. Layout is easy. Information is plentiful. **Comment #2:** Site showed consistency throughout, but a bit plain. **Comment #3:** There is useful information, but the extended loading time detracted from the site's ease of use.

Table C42: South Dakota Department of Agriculture <http://www.state.sd.us/doa/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
5	4.5	4.67	5

Comment #1: Very nice overall. Information is easy to find. **Comment #2:** Provides a lot of contact information. **Comment #3:** It's a good site with plenty of useful information.

Table C43: Tennessee Department of Agriculture www.state.tn.us/agriculture

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.33	4.33	4.33	4.33

Comment #1: Very organized, although the visual appeal could be improved. **Comment #2:** Various colors help different menu items stand out. **Comment #3:** The web site is attractive and provides useful services.

Table C44: Texas Department of Agriculture <http://www.agr.state.tx.us/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	3.67	4.67	5

Comment #1: The blocky visuals detract from an otherwise very nice site. **Comment #2:** Too many descriptions on home page but it is nice to know what is under each link. **Comment #3:** The site is inviting and presents featured programs well. Much information is also available in Spanish.

Table C45: State of Utah Department of Agriculture and Food <http://www.ag.state.ut.us/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	3.67	4.67	4.67

Comment #1: A standard-looking site, but information loads quickly and layout is easy to navigate. **Comment #2:** Many of the links on this page would not load which was very disappointing because at first glance, the site appears to offer a wealth of data. **Comment #3:** There is a great deal of information available, but it looks a bit plain.

Table C46: Vermont Agency of Agriculture, Food, and Markets www.vermontagriculture.com

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
5	3	4.33	5

Comment #1: Visual appeal is average, but the site loads quickly and information is very easy to find. **Comment #2:** Plain structure but it is clear what the site contains.

Comment #3: It has a basic design but it does what it should do.

Table C47: Virgin Islands (United States) Department of Agriculture

<http://www.usvi.org/agriculture/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
5	3.67	3	2.67

Comment #1: Small site with a standard layout, but what's there is easy to find.

Comment #2: A little difficult to navigate, lacks effective menu headings. **Comment #3:** They have a presence on the web, but they should add more links and repair the broken links on the home page.

Table C48: Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

<http://www.vdacs.virginia.gov/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4	4.33	4.67	4.33

Comment #1: Good information, easy to find. Average looking layout. **Comment #2:** Good design, very professional; offers a lot of information. **Comment #3:** This is a nice site, with icons to make it user-friendly.

Table C49: Washington State Department of Agriculture <http://agr.wa.gov/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
5	4.33	4	4.33

Comment #1: Good information, easy to find, average layout. **Comment #2:** Site showed consistency and it is well developed. **Comment #3:** It is an attractive site. The fact that the FAQ link went to an "under construction" page and the search function did not return results for the terms I selected indicate the limited usefulness of this site.

Table C50: West Virginia Department of Agriculture www.wvagriculture.org/

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.33	4.33	4.33	4.67
Comment #1: Professional and clean. Easy to navigate and easy to look at. Comment #2: Menu provides current articles in addition to basic agricultural information.			
Comment #3: This is a useful site, but I experienced a couple of broken links.			

Table C51: Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection
<http://datcp.state.wi.us/index.jsp>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
3.33	4	4.33	4.67
Comment #1: Very nice overall. Content is clear and easy to find. Comment #2: The design and layout of this site look very nice. Comment #3: All the pages looked similar, not too attractive. Plus, there wasn't a great deal of information available.			

Table C52: Wyoming Department of Agriculture <http://wyagric.state.wy.us/>

Overall Effectiveness: 

Loading Time	Visual Appeal	Ease of Navigation	Quantity of Useful Information
4.67	4	4.67	4.33
Comment #1: A clean, but basic site. Good information is easy to find. Comment #2: This website is visually appealing with good photos, and also has the feature of opening links in a new browser. Comment #3: It's an attractive web site with a substantial amount of information. I experienced intermittent problems with broken links, however.			

Index of Web Site Ratings

A

Alabama A & M University: Table A1, pg. 17, <http://www.aamu.edu/>

Alabama A & M University: Department of Agribusiness: Table B1, pg. 36,
<http://saes.aamu.edu/agb/agbIndex.html>

Alabama Department of Agriculture and Industries: Table C1, pg. 53, www.agi.state.al.us/

Alaska Department of Natural Resources Division of Agriculture: Table C2, pg. 54,
<http://www.dnr.state.ak.us/ag/>
 University of Alaska, Fairbanks: Table A2, pg. 18, <http://www.uaf.edu/>
 Alcorn State University (Mississippi): Table A3, pg. 18, <http://www.alcorn.edu/>
 University of Arizona: Table A4, pg. 18, <http://www.arizona.edu/>
 University of Arizona: Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics: Table B2, pg. 36,
<http://ag.arizona.edu/arec/>
 Arizona Department of Agriculture: Table C3, pg. 54, <http://agriculture.state.az.us/>
 University of Arkansas, Fayetteville: Table A5, pg. 18, <http://www.uark.edu/>
 University of Arkansas, Fayetteville: Department of Agricultural Economics and Agribusiness:
 Table B3, pg. 36, <http://www.uark.edu/depts/agriecon/>
 University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff: Table A6, pg. 19, <http://www.uapb.edu/>
 Arkansas State Plant Board: Table C4, pg. 54, <http://www.plantboard.org>
 Auburn University (Alabama): Table A7, pg. 19, <http://www.auburn.edu/>
 Auburn University: Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology: Table B4, pg.
 37, <http://www.ag.auburn.edu/dept/aec/aec.html>

B

C

University of California, Berkeley: Table A8, pg. 19, www.berkeley.edu
 University of California, Berkeley: Agricultural and Resource Economics Department: Table B5,
 pg. 37, <http://are.berkeley.edu/>
 University of California, Davis: Table A9, pg. 19, <http://www.ucdavis.edu/index.html>
 University of California, Davis: Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics: Table B6,
 pg. 37, <http://www.agecon.ucdavis.edu/>
 California Department of Food and Agriculture: Table C5, pg. 54, <http://www.cdfa.ca.gov/>
 Clemson University (South Carolina): Table A10, pg. 20, <http://www.clemson.edu/>
 Clemson University (South Carolina): Agricultural Economics Department: Table B7, pg. 38,
http://cherokee.agecon.clemson.edu/u_grad1.htm
 Colorado Department of Agriculture: Table C6, pg. 55, www.ag.state.co.us
 Colorado State University: Table A11, pg. 20, www.colostate.edu/
 Colorado State University: Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics: Table B8, pg.
 38, <http://dare.agsci.colostate.edu/csusagecon/default.htm>
 University of Connecticut: Table A12, pg. 20, <http://www.uconn.edu/>
 University of Connecticut: Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics: Table B9, pg.
 38, <http://www.are.uconn.edu/>
 State of Connecticut Department of Agriculture: Table C7, pg. 55, <http://www.ct.gov/doag>
 Cornell University (New York): Table A13, pg. 20, <http://www.cornell.edu/>
 Cornell University: Department of Applied Economics and Management: Table B10, pg. 39,
<http://aem.cornell.edu/>

D

University of Delaware: Table A14, pg. 21, <http://www.udel.edu/>
Delaware Department of Agriculture: Table C8, pg. 55, <http://www.state.de.us/deptagri/>
University of Delaware: Department of Food and Resource Economics: Table B11, pg. 39, <http://ag.udel.edu/frec/>
Delaware State University: Table A15, pg. 21, <http://www.desu.edu/>
University of the District of Columbia: Table A16, pg. 21, <http://www.universityofdc.org/>

E

F

University of Florida: Table A17, pg. 21, <http://www.ufl.edu/>
Florida A&M University: Table A18, pg. 22, <http://www.famu.edu/>
Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services: Table C9, pg. 55, <http://doacs.state.fl.us/>
University of Florida: Food and Resource Economics Department: Table B12, pg. 39, <http://www.fred.ifas.ufl.edu/>
Fort Valley State University (Georgia): Table A19, pg. 22, <http://www.fvsu.edu/>
Fort Valley State University (Georgia): Department of Agricultural Economics: Table B13, pg. 40, http://www.fvsu.edu/coaheap/ag_econ.asp

G

University of Georgia: Table A20, pg. 22, <http://www.uga.edu/>
University of Georgia: Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics: Table B14, pg. 40, <http://www.agecon.uga.edu/>
Georgia Department of Agriculture: Table C10, pg. 56, <http://www.agr.state.ga.us/>
University of Guam: Table A21, pg. 22, www.uog.edu

H

University of Hawaii System: Table A22, pg. 23, www.hawaii.edu
Hawaii Department of Agriculture: Table C11, pg. 56, www.hawaiiag.org/hdoa/

I

University of Idaho: Table A23, pg. 23, www.uihome.uidaho.edu
University of Idaho: Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology: Table B15, pg. 40, <http://www.ag.uidaho.edu/aers/>
Idaho State Department of Agriculture: Table C12, pg. 56, www.agri.state.id.us
University of Illinois: Table A24, pg. 23, <http://www.uillinois.edu/>
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign: Department of Agricultural and Consumer Economics: Table B16, pg. 41, <http://www.ace.uiuc.edu/>
Illinois Department of Agriculture: Table C13, pg. 56, <http://www.agr.state.il.us/>
Indiana State Department of Agriculture: Table C14, pg. 57, www.in.gov/oca/

Iowa Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship: Table C15, pg. 57,
<http://www.agriculture.state.ia.us>

Iowa State University: Table A25, pg. 23, <http://www.iastate.edu/>

Iowa State University: Department of Economics: Table B17, pg. 41,
<http://www.econ.iastate.edu/>

J

K

Kansas Department of Agriculture: Table C16, pg. 57, <http://www.ksda.gov>

Kansas State University: Table A26, pg. 24, www.ksu.edu

Kansas State University: Agricultural Economics Department: Table B18, pg. 41,
www.agecon.ksu.edu/home/homepage.htm

University of Kentucky: Table A27, pg. 24, www.uky.edu

University of Kentucky: Department of Agricultural Economics: Table B19, pg. 42,
<http://www.uky.edu/Ag/AgEcon/>

Kentucky Department of Agriculture: Table C17, pg. 57, <http://www.kyagr.com>

Kentucky State University: Table A28, pg. 24, www.kysu.edu

L

Langston University (Oklahoma): Table A29, pg. 24, <http://www.lunet.edu/>

Lincoln University of Missouri: Table A30, pg. 25, <http://www.lincolnu.edu/>

Louisiana Department of Agriculture and Forestry: Table C18, pg. 58,
<http://www.ldaf.state.la.us/>

Louisiana State University: Table A31, pg. 25, www.lsu.edu/

Louisiana State University: Department of Agricultural Economics and Agribusiness: Table B20,
pg. 42, <http://www.agecon.lsu.edu/>

M

University of Maine: Table A32, pg. 25, <http://www.umaine.edu/>

Maine Department of Agriculture, Food and Rural Resources: Table C19, pg. 58,
<http://www.maine.gov/agriculture/index.shtml>

University of Maine: Department of Resource Economics and Policy: Table B21, pg. 42,
<http://www.ume.maine.edu/~rep/rep.htm>

University of Maryland: Table A33, pg. 25, <http://www.umd.edu/>

University of Maryland: Agricultural and Resource Economics Department: Table B22, pg. 43,
<http://www.arec.umd.edu/>

Maryland Department of Agriculture: Table C20, pg. 58, <http://www.mda.state.md.us/>

University of Massachusetts, Amherst: Table A34, pg. 26, <http://www.umass.edu/>

University of Massachusetts, Amherst: Department of Resource Economics: Table B23, pg. 43,
<http://www.umass.edu/resec/>

Massachusetts Department of Agricultural Resources: Table C21, pg. 58,
<http://www.mass.gov/agr/>
 Michigan State University: Table A35, pg. 26, www.msu.edu
 Michigan State University: Department of Agricultural Economics: Table B24, 43,
www.aec.msu.edu/agecon/
 Michigan Department of Agriculture: Table C22, pg. 59, www.michigan.gov/mda
 University of Minnesota: Table A36, pg. 26, www.umn.edu
 Minnesota Department of Agriculture: Table C23, pg. 59, www.mda.state.mn.us
 University of Minnesota: Department of Applied Economics: Table B25, pg. 44,
www.apec.umn.edu
 Mississippi Department of Agriculture and Commerce: Table C24, pg. 59,
<http://www.mdac.state.ms.us/>
 Mississippi State University: Table A37, pg. 26, www.msstate.edu
 Mississippi State University: Department of Agricultural Economics: Table B26, pg. 44,
<http://www.agecon.msstate.edu/>
 University of Missouri-Columbia: Table A38, pg. 27, <http://www.missouri.edu/>
 University of Missouri-Columbia: Department of Agricultural Economics: Table B27, pg. 44,
<http://www.ssu.missouri.edu/AgEcon/>
 Missouri Department of Agriculture: Table C25, pg. 59, <http://www.mda.mo.gov/>
 Montana Department of Agriculture: Table C26, pg. 60, <http://agr.state.mt.us/>
 Montana State University: Table A39, pg. 27, <http://www.montana.edu/>
 Montana State University: Department of Agricultural Economics and Economics: Table B28,
 pg. 45, <http://www.montana.edu/econ/>

N

Nebraska Department of Agriculture: Table C27, pg. 60, www.agr.state.ne.us/
 University of Nebraska-Lincoln: Table A40, pg. 27, www.unl.edu
 University of Nebraska-Lincoln: Department of Agricultural Economics: Table B29, pg. 45,
<http://agecon.unl.edu/>
 Nevada Department of Agriculture: Table C28, pg. 60, <http://agri.state.nv.us/>
 University of Nevada, Reno: Table A41, pg. 27, www.unr.edu
 University of Nevada, Reno: Department of Resource Economics: Table B30, pg. 45,
<http://www.cabnr.unr.edu/re>
 University of New Hampshire: Table A42, pg. 28, <http://unhinfo.unh.edu/index.html>
 New Hampshire Department of Agriculture, Markets, and Food: Table C29, pg. 60,
<http://agriculture.nh.gov/>
 University of New Hampshire: Department of Resource Economics and Development: Table
 B31, pg. 46, <http://www.dred.unh.edu/>
 New Jersey Department of Agriculture: Table C30, pg. 61, www.state.nj.us/agriculture
 New Mexico Department of Agriculture: Table C31, pg. 61, <http://nmdaweb.nmsu.edu/>
 New Mexico State University: Table A43, pg. 28, <http://www.nmsu.edu>
 New Mexico State University: Department of Agricultural Economics and Agricultural Business:
 Table B32, pg. 46, <http://spectre.nmsu.edu/dept/welcome.html?t=aeab>

New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets: Table C32, pg. 61,
<http://www.agmkt.state.ny.us/>
 North Carolina A&T State University: Table A44, pg. 28, <http://www.ncat.edu/>
 North Carolina A&T State University: Department of Agribusiness, Applied Economics and
 Agriscience Education: Table B33, pg. 46,
<http://www.ag.ncat.edu/agribusiness/index.html>
 North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services: Table C33, pg. 61,
<http://www.agr.state.nc.us/>
 North Carolina State University: Table A45, pg. 28, <http://www.ncsu.edu/>
 North Carolina State University: Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics: Table
 B34, pg. 47, <http://www.ag-econ.ncsu.edu/>
 North Dakota Department of Agriculture: Table C34, pg. 62, <http://www.agdepartment.com/>
 North Dakota State University: Table A46, pg. 29, <http://www.ndsu.nodak.edu/>
 North Dakota State University: Department of Agribusiness and Applied Economics: Table B35,
 pg. 47, <http://www.ext.nodak.edu/homepages/aeddept/>

O

Ohio Department of Agriculture: Table C35, pg. 62, <http://www.ohioagriculture.gov/>
 The Ohio State University: Table A47, pg. 29, <http://www.osu.edu/index.php>
 The Ohio State University: Department of Agricultural, Environmental, and Development
 Economics: Table B36, pg. 47, <http://www-agecon.ag.ohio-state.edu/>
 Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry: Table C36, pg. 62,
<http://www.oda.state.ok.us/>
 Oklahoma State University: Table A48, pg. 29, <http://osu.okstate.edu/>
 Oklahoma State University: Department of Agricultural Economics: Table B37, pg. 48,
<http://agecon.okstate.edu/>
 Oregon Department of Agriculture: Table C37, pg. 62, <http://egov.oregon.gov/ODA/>
 Oregon State University: Table A49, pg. 29, <http://oregonstate.edu>
 Oregon State University: Agricultural and Resource Department: Table B38, pg. 48,
<http://arec.oregonstate.edu/>

P

Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture: Table C38, pg. 63, <http://www.agriculture.state.pa.us/>
 Pennsylvania State University: Table A50, pg. 30, <http://www.psu.edu/>
 Pennsylvania State University: Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology:
 Table B39, pg. 48, <http://www.aers.psu.edu/>
 Prairie View A&M University (Texas): Table A51, pg. 30, <http://www.pvamu.edu/>
 Puerto Rico Department of Agriculture: Table C39, pg. 63,
<http://www.agricultura.gobierno.pr/main.asp>
 University of Puerto Rico Mayaguez Campus: Table A52, pg. 30, <http://www.uprm.edu/>
 Purdue University (Indiana): Table A53, pg. 30, <http://www.purdue.edu/>
 Purdue University: Department of Agricultural Economics: Table B40, pg. 49,
www.agecon.purdue.edu (Ag. Econ.)

Q

R

University of Rhode Island: Table A54, pg. 31, www.uri.edu

University of Rhode Island: Department of Environmental and Natural Resource Economics: Table B41, pg. 49, <http://www.uri.edu/cels/enre/ie.html>

Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management: Table C40, pg. 63, <http://www.state.ri.us/dem/>

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey: Table A55, pg. 31, www.rutgers.edu

Rutgers - the State University of New Jersey: Department of Agricultural, Food, and Resource Economics: Table B42, pg. 49, <http://www.dafre.rutgers.edu/>

S

South Carolina Department of Agriculture: Table C41, pg. 63, <http://www.scdas.state.sc.us/>

South Carolina State University: Table A56, pg. 31, <http://www.scsu.edu/>

South Carolina State University: Department of Accounting, Agribusiness, and Economics: Table B43, pg. 50, <http://www.scsu.edu/Academics/Colleges/Departments/index.cfm?ID=6>

South Dakota Department of Agriculture: Table C42, pg. 64, <http://www.state.sd.us/doa/>

South Dakota State University: Table A57, pg. 31, <http://www3.sdstate.edu/>

South Dakota State University: Department of Economics: Table B44, pg. 50, <http://econ.sdstate.edu/>

Southern University and A&M College (Louisiana): Table A58, pg. 32, <http://www.subr.edu/>

T

University of Tennessee: Table A59, pg. 32, <http://www.utk.edu/>

University of Tennessee: Department of Agricultural Economics: Table B45, pg. 50, <http://economics.ag.utk.edu/>

Tennessee Department of Agriculture: Table C43, pg. 64, www.state.tn.us/agriculture

Tennessee State University: Table A60, pg. 32, <http://www.tnstate.edu/>

Texas A&M University: Table A61, pg. 32, <http://www.tamu.edu/>

Texas A&M University: Department of Agricultural Economics: Table B46, pg. 51, <http://agecon.tamu.edu/>

Texas Department of Agriculture: Table C44, pg. 64, <http://www.agr.state.tx.us/>

Tuskegee University (Alabama): Table A62, pg. 33, <http://www.tuskegee.edu/>

U

State of Utah Department of Agriculture and Food: Table C45, pg. 64, <http://www.ag.state.ut.us/>

Utah State University: Table A63, pg. 33, <http://www.usu.edu>

Utah State University: Department of Economics: Table B47, pg. 51, <http://www.econ.usu.edu/>

V

University of Vermont: Table A64, pg. 33, www.uvm.edu
University of Vermont: Department of Community Development and Applied Economics: Table B48, pg. 51, <http://www.uvm.edu/~cdae/>
Vermont Agency of Agriculture, Food, and Markets: Table C46, pg. 65, www.vermontagriculture.com
University of the Virgin Islands: Table A65, pg. 33, <http://www.uvi.edu>
Virgin Islands (United States) Department of Agriculture: Table C47, pg. 65, <http://www.usvi.org/agriculture/>
Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services: Table C48, pg. 65, <http://www.vdacs.virginia.gov/>
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University: Table A66, pg. 34, <http://www.vt.edu/>
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University: Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics: Table B49, pg. 52, <http://www.aaec.vt.edu/aaec/>
Virginia State University: Table A67, pg. 34, <http://www.vsu.edu/pages/1.asp>

W

Washington State Department of Agriculture: Table C49, pg. 65, <http://agr.wa.gov/>
Washington State University: Table A68, pg. 34, <http://www.wsu.edu/>
Washington State University: School of Economic Sciences: Table B50, pg. 52, <http://www.ses.wsu.edu/>
West Virginia Department of Agriculture: Table C50, pg. 66, www.wvagriculture.org/
West Virginia State University: Table A69, pg. 34, <http://www.wvstateu.edu/>
West Virginia University: Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics: Table B51, pg. 52, <http://www.caf.wvu.edu/resm/are/index.html>
West Virginia University: Table A70, pg. 35, <http://www.wvu.edu>
Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection: Table C51, pg. 66, <http://datcp.state.wi.us/index.jsp>
University of Wisconsin-Madison: Table A71, pg. 35, <http://www.wisc.edu/>
University of Wisconsin-Madison: Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics: Table B52, pg. 53, <http://www.aae.wisc.edu/www/>
University of Wyoming: Table A72, pg. 35, www.uwyo.edu
University of Wyoming: Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics: Table B53, pg. 53, <http://www.uwyo.edu/agecon/>
Wyoming Department of Agriculture: Table C52, pg. 66, <http://wyagric.state.wy.us/>